	Case 2:22-cv-01281-DAD-SCR Docu	ment 42	Filed 01/30/25	Page 1 of 2	
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
10					
11	BRANDON EUGENE HUNTER,	No	o. 2:22-cv-01281-D	AD-SCR (PC)	
12	Plaintiff,		RDER ADOPTING		
13	v.	TH	IIS ACTION DUE		
14	JACKOWITZ, et al.,			COURT'S ORDERS	
15	Defendants.	(D	oc. Nos. 31, 41.)		
16					
17	Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed this civil rights action seeking relief				
18	under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to				
19	28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.				
20	On October 16, 2024, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations				
21	which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objections to				
22	the findings and recommendations were to be filed within twenty-one (21) days. Therein the				
23	magistrate judge recommended that this case be dismissed due to plaintiff's failure to comply				
24	with the discovery rules and with court orders. (Doc. No. 41.) Specifically, the magistrate judge				
25	concluded:				
26	The history of this case shows that plaintiff has willfully failed to respond to discovery properly propounded by defendants. Defendants have been forced to expend resources and time filing two				
27					
28	motions to compel and attending a properly scheduled deposition that				
		1			

1 2	plaintiff refused to attend. Considering the five factors set out above, dismissal of this action is appropriate under Rules 37(b) and 37(d).				
3	(Id. at 6.) Neither party has filed objections to the findings and recommendations and the time in				
4	which to do so has passed.				
5	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, this				
6	court has conducted a <i>de novo</i> review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the				
7	court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper				
8	analysis.				
9	Accordingly:				
10	1. The findings and recommendations (Doc. No. 41) are adopted in full;				
11	2. This case is dismissed due to plaintiff's failure to comply with the discovery rules and				
12	with court orders;				
13	3. Defendants' motions to compel and for sanctions (Doc. No. 31) are denied as having				
14	been rendered moot by this order; and				
15	4. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case.				
16	IT IS SO ORDERED.				
17	Dated: January 29, 2025				
18	DALE A. DROZD UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE				
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
20	4				

Case 2:22-cv-01281-DAD-SCR Document 42 Filed 01/30/25 Page 2 of 2